

REMARKS

Claim 2 is amended in a further effort to define invention over the art of record. Claim 21 is amended to maintain consistent terminology with parent Claim 2, and to correct an inadvertent error in the claim from which Claim 21 depends. New Claims 22 and 23 are added in a further effort to define subject matter the inventors consider patentable over the applied art.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 21-23 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Claim 2 stands rejected as unpatentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect* V6.1. The applicants respectfully traverse that rejection.

Summary of Examiner Interview

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Vaughn for the telephone interviews with the undersigned on October 3 and 4, 2005. The undersigned presented proposed amendments to Claims 2 and 21, and the proposed amendments to Claim 2 were discussed during those interviews. The currently-amended Claims 2 and 21 presented in this response are substantially as presented to and discussed with the examiner during the interviews. However, new Claims 22 and 23 were not presented nor discussed during those interviews.

Arguments

The applicants have invented and are claiming a computer-implemented method for populating a plurality of fields in a find dialog of a spreadsheet program. The plural formatting characteristics are chosen in response to moving a cursor over a cell containing those formatting characteristics and clicking a mouse button to select that cell.

In response to thus selecting the cell, the formatting characteristics of that cell are determined and applied to the plurality of fields of the find dialog.

The present invention as presented in the claims is thus a computer-implemented method for populating fields in a find dialog simply by selecting a cell already containing the desired formatting characteristics. In response to that cell selection, the formatting characteristics of the selected cell are determined and applied to populate the fields of the find dialog.

The art applied to reject Claim 2 simply fails to teach or suggest a computer-implemented method in which formatting characteristics of a cell are determined and applied to a plurality of fields of a find dialog, in response to selecting the cell. The applicants do not dispute that *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect* disclose the mere act of selecting a cell, an act which is basic to contemporary spreadsheet programs. However, that existing knowledge of selecting a cell has nothing that would have suggested, to one of ordinary skill, a computer-implemented method for determining the formatting characteristics of the selected cell and applying those characteristics to a plurality of fields in a find dialog in response to selecting the cell.

Underdahl and *WordPerfect* each disclose techniques for finding and replacing data in cells. *Underdahl* uses a find/replace dialog, and *WordPerfect* discloses searching for a "code" that controls formatting attributes. However, neither *WordPerfect* nor *Underdahl* discloses or suggests anything whatsoever for populating the fields of a find dialog with formatting attributes of selected a cell in the spreadsheet. Furthermore, neither reference discloses or even hints at a computer-implemented method of populating the fields in a find dialog of a spreadsheet program in response to selecting a

cell containing those formatting characteristics. These teachings come only from the applicants, and not from the art of record. Accordingly, Claim 2 and the claims depending therefrom are patentably distinct from that art.

Claims 5 and 21 are rejected as unpatentable over *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect*, further in view of *Corel Draw*. *Corel* is cited as disclosing an eyedropper cursor. However, the cited combination of art fails to teach the computer-implemented method of parent Claim 2 as mentioned above.

Dependent Claim 21 adds that choosing the plurality of formatting characteristics further comprises selecting an option of choosing the formatting characteristics from a formatted cell in the spreadsheet and, in response to selecting that option, changing the shape of the cursor from the first shape to a distinctive second shape. That second shape tells a user that moving the cursor over a cell and clicking the mouse button will determine the formatting characteristics of that cell and apply those formatting characteristics to the fields of the find dialog. (A discussion of the choose-format-from-cell option appears at page 13 of the present specification) *Corel* merely discloses an eyedropper cursor tool to pick a color from a picture and set that as a primary, secondary, or background color. Nothing in that reference, alone or together with anything found in *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect*, would have suggested to one of ordinary skill a computer-implemented method comprising the specific steps of Claim 21. Accordingly, that claim and Claims 5-7 depending therefrom are patentable over that art.

Turning to new Claim 22, that claim defines the present method using somewhat different verbiage from the preceding claims but including the novel and unobvious limitations discussed hereinabove. Namely, Claim 22 defines a computer-implemented

method for populating a plurality of fields defining certain formatting characteristics in a find dialog of a spreadsheet program. This method comprises choosing a plurality of formatting characteristics of a formatted cell by moving a cursor over the cell and clicking a mouse button to select that cell. In response to selecting the cell, the present method determines the formatting characteristics of the selected cell and populates those formatting characteristics to the fields in the find dialog. New Claim 22 thus defines the present method as comprising a combination of computer-implemented steps not disclosed or made obvious by the art of record. Nothing in *Underdahl*, *WordPerfect* or basic spreadsheet-cell selection even remotely suggests choosing the formatting characteristics of a cell by selecting the cell, and in response to selecting that cell, determining the formatting characteristics of the cell and populating those determined formatting characteristics to the fields in the find dialog. That method as defined by new Claim 22 comes only from the present applicants, not from anything in the art of record. Accordingly, new Claim 22 is patentable over that art.

New Claim 23 depends from Claim 22 and adds the step of applying the determined formatting characteristics, populated to the find dialog as in parent Claim 22, to at least one other cell by selecting the other cell. By populating the fields of a find dialog according to the present invention as defined in parent Claim 22, those formatting characteristics are applied to at least one other cell simply by selecting the other cell. The customary find-and- replace procedure as shown in *Underdahl* and *WordPerfect*, for example, is thus significantly simplified and streamlined by the present method as disclosed and claims. That method is properly patentable, because the art of record


S/N 09/755,863

contains no teaching nor suggestion of the method invented by the present applicants and herein claimed. Accordingly, new Claims 22 and 23 are patentable over the art of record.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The applicants submit that all claims remaining in this application are patentable and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD


Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: October 17, 2005

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

